

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8 and 10-64 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and forwarding of the application onto issuance.

### **Drawing Objections**

Applicant notes that the drawings have been objected to by the Official Draftsperson. Applicant submits herewith drawing corrections for those drawings identified by the Official Draftsperson.

### **§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 24-26, 37-39, 48-49, 54-59, and 62-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(3) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,581,062 to Draper et al (hereinafter "Draper").

### **§103 Rejections**

Claims 2-8, 10-19, 27-28, 30-31, 40-43 and 60-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,295,261 to Simonetti.

Claims 20-23, 29, 32-36, 44-47, and 50-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,601 to Papierniak et al. (hereinafter "Papierniak").

### **Applicant's Disclosure**

1 Applicant's disclosure notes that there is an unsolved need to be able to  
2 create context-aware computing in which computing devices can participate in  
3 their particular context. In specific circumstances, there are unsolved needs to  
4 provide relational position awareness among physical locations in both public and  
5 private views of the world.

6 Applicant's claimed subject matter relates to context aware computing  
7 systems and methods. In various embodiments, one or more hierarchical tree  
8 structures are defined that uniquely identify geographical divisions of the Earth  
9 and/or physical or logical entities. Each tree has multiple nodes and at least one  
10 node from each tree is linked. Goods and services can be associated with  
11 individual nodes on the tree such that the nodes provide a universal reference  
12 when attempting to locate or consume the goods or services. By knowing where a  
13 device is located within a hierarchical structure, in at least some embodiments, the  
14 applications can present location-dependent goods or services to the user. Thus, a  
15 user is able to actively participate in their current computing environment.

### 16 17 **The Draper Reference**

18 Draper's disclosure relates to a completely different subject matter – that is,  
19 the storage of data. Draper discloses a method and apparatus for storing semi-  
20 structured data in a structured manner. Semi-structured data might be XML  
21 encoded data, which is then stored in an SQL database, a form of structured data  
22 storage. Draper utilizes a mapper to generate a structured organization to store the  
23 collection of semi-structured data. The mapper further collaterally generates a  
24 description of how the semi-structured data are stored under the structured  
25 organization.

1 Draper's disclosure can perhaps best be understood by reference to FIGS.  
2 2a, 2b, and 3. FIGS. 2a-2b illustrate an example of semi-structured data and its  
3 logical representation. As illustrated, semi-structured data 54' includes a number of  
4 entities or data elements, each delineated by a pair of tags, e.g. entity A by tags  
5 <entity A> and </entity A>, entity B by tags <entity B> and </entity B>, and so  
6 forth. Some entities, like entities F and H have multiple instantiations. The  
7 entities/instantiations have an hierarchical relationship to each other; and may be  
8 logically represented by tree structure 60, having corresponding number of nodes,  
9 one for each entity/instantiation, and edges interconnecting the nodes whose  
10 represented entities/instantiations are direct ancestors/descendants of each other,  
11 as shown.

12 Draper's FIG. 3 illustrates a structured organization for storing the semi-  
13 structured data of FIGS. 2a-2b. As illustrated, structured organization 52' includes  
14 four relational tables 62-68. Table 62 includes one column each for storing  
15 identifiers of entities A, B, C, D, E, and G, and data for entities C and D. Table 64  
16 includes one column each for storing identifiers for entities E and F, and data for  
17 entities F, whereas table 66 includes one column each for storing identifiers for  
18 entities G and F, and data for entities F. Similarly, table 68 includes one column  
19 each for storing identifiers for entities A, H and I, and data for entity I. The  
20 organization of these relational tables is characterized by the fact that entities  
21 having the possibility of multiple instantiations are stored in separate tables. The  
22 approach is said to be a normalized organization of the relational tables.

23 Applicant respectfully submits that Draper's methods and systems for  
24 storing data are in no way analogous to Applicant's claimed subject matter relating  
25 to context-aware computing. In fact, Draper's disclosure seems to have no

1 relevance to context-aware computing at all. Furthermore, Draper does not  
2 disclose or suggest any relationship between his methods of storing data and any  
3 attempt to connect a user with goods or services.

### 4 5 **Claims 1-23**

6 **Claim 1** recites a system for determining context comprising [emphasis  
7 added]:

- 8 • one or more computer-readable media; and
- 9 • a hierarchical tree structure resident on the media and comprising  
10 multiple nodes each of which represent geographical divisions of the  
11 Earth, individual nodes comprising an entity identification (EID) that  
12 is unique to the node, EIDs serving as a *basis by which attributes*  
13 *can be assigned to goods or services* associated with an individual  
14 node, said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at  
15 least some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes  
16 having EIDs that are unique for the associated node.

17 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
18 discloses EIDs serving as a basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or  
19 services associated with an individual node. The Office cites to column 5, lines  
20 38-55, and column 6, lines 40-56, reproduced below, in support of its argument.

21 FIGS. 6a-6b illustrate an example semi-structured data 54" and its  
22 logical representation. The example "directory" semi-structured data  
23 54", delineated by the <directory> and </directory> tags 100 and  
24 150, as illustrated in FIG. 6a, includes the entities "person", "name",  
25 "first name", "last name", "home", "address", "line1", "city", "state",  
"zip", "phone" (in the context of "home"), "work", and "phone" (in  
the context of "work"), delineated by the respective tag pairs, i.e.  
102 and 148, 104 and 128, and so forth. The example "directory"  
semi-structured data may be logically represented by tree structure  
60' of FIG. 6b. Tree structure 60' includes root node "directory" 162,  
"person" node 164, "name" node 166, "first name" node 168, "last

1 name" node 170, "home" node 172, "address" node 174, "line 1"  
2 node 176, "city" node 178, "state" node 180, "zip" node 182, "home  
3 phone" node 184, "work" node 186, and "work phone" node 188.  
4 *Col. 5, lines 38-55.*

5 FIG. 9 illustrates the operational flow of mapper 50 for generating  
6 semi-structured organization 54 for structured data 52. At 202,  
7 mapper 50 transforms structured data 52 adding corresponding  
8 companion columns to the tables to store entity identifiers for the  
9 stored entity data. In one embodiment, mapper 50 also adds  
10 corresponding columns to the tables to store a composite key formed  
11 with the access keys of the tables. For example, in a table, having  
12 two columns storing the last and first names of persons as accessing  
13 keys, a column is added to store a composite key formed with the  
14 last and first names of the persons. At 204, mapper 50 constructs a  
15 logical tree structure similar to the ones illustrated in FIG. 2b and 6b,  
16 based on the columns storing entity identifiers. At 206, mapper 50  
17 creates meta table 56 as described earlier. At 208, mapper 50  
18 generates semi-structured organization 54 using the generated  
19 logical tree structure. *Col. 6, lines 40-56.*

20 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
21 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even remotely suggests "individual  
22 nodes comprising an entity identification (EID) that is unique to the node, EIDs  
23 serving as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services*  
24 associated with an individual node." As discussed above, Draper's disclosure deals  
25 with converting semi-structured data, such as XML encoded data, to structured  
data storage, such as an SQL database. Draper does not disclose or suggest matter  
in which EIDs serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or  
services* associated with an individual node. Accordingly, for at least this reason,  
claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-8 and 10-23 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending  
from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own

1 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither  
2 disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination  
3 with one another. Given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claims 2-  
4 8 and 10-19 over the combination with Simonetti is not seen to add anything of  
5 significance.

### 6 7 Claims 24-36

8 **Claim 24** recites a system for determining context comprising [emphasis  
9 added]:

- 10 • one or more computer-readable media;
- 11 • a first hierarchical tree structure having multiple nodes associated  
12 with a first context;
- 13 • at least one second hierarchical tree structure having multiple nodes  
14 associated with a second context; and
- 15 • at least one node from the at least one second hierarchical tree  
16 structure being linked with one node on the first hierarchical tree  
17 structure by a link that is configured to enable a complete context to  
18 be derived from the first and second contexts, individual nodes  
19 having unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can  
20 be assigned to goods or services*,
- 21 • said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at least  
22 some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes having  
23 IDs that are unique for the associated node.

24 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
25 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office again cites to column 5,  
lines 38-55, and column 6, lines 40-56, reproduced above, in support of its  
argument.

1 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
2 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
3 unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods*  
4 *or services*. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
5 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database. Draper  
6 does not disclose or suggest matter in which unique IDs serve as a *basis by which*  
7 *attributes can be assigned to goods or services*. Accordingly, for at least this  
8 reason, claim 24 is allowable.

9 **Claims 25-36** depend from claim 24 and are allowable as depending from  
10 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
11 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 24, are neither disclosed  
12 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
13 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claims  
14 27-28 and 30-31 over the combination with Simonetti, and claims 29 and 32-36  
15 over the combination with Papierniak, is not seen to add anything of significance.

#### 16 17 **Claims 37-47**

18 **Claim 37** recites a method of determining context comprising [emphasis  
19 added]:

- 20
- 21 • accessing first and one or more second hierarchical tree structures  
22 that are resident on one or more computer-readable media, each tree  
23 structure having multiple nodes, the nodes of the first hierarchical  
24 tree structure being associated with a first context, the nodes of the  
25 one or more second hierarchical tree structures being associated with  
a second context; and  
traversing multiple nodes of at least one of the tree structures to  
derive a context, individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve  
as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services*,

1 said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at least  
2 some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes having  
3 IDs that are unique for the associated node.

4 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
5 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
6 attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office apparently cites again  
7 to column 5, lines 38-55, and column 6, lines 40-56, reproduced above, in support  
8 of its argument.

9 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
10 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
11 unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods*  
12 *or services*. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
13 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database. For at  
14 least this reason, claim 37 is allowable.

15 **Claims 38-47** depend from claim 37 and are allowable as depending from  
16 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
17 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 37, are neither disclosed  
18 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
19 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claims  
20 40-43 over the combination with Simonetti, and claims 44-47 over the  
21 combination with Papierniak, is not seen to add anything of significance.

22 **Claims 48-53**

23 **Claim 48** is directed to a computer-readable medium having instructions  
24 that cause a computing device to [emphasis added]:  
25



1 access first and second hierarchical tree structures, each tree  
2 structure having multiple nodes, the nodes of the first hierarchical  
3 tree structure being associated with a first location context, the nodes  
4 of the second hierarchical tree structure being associated with a  
5 second location context, at least one node of the second hierarchical  
6 tree structure being linked with a node of the first hierarchical tree  
7 structure; and

- 8 • traverse at least one node of each tree structure to derive a location  
9 context, at least one node in a traversal path that leads to a root node  
10 of the second hierarchical tree structure being linked with a node of  
11 the first hierarchical tree structure, individual nodes having unique  
12 IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to  
13 goods or services*, said multiple nodes comprising parent and  
14 children nodes, at least some of the parent nodes and their associated  
15 children nodes having IDs that are unique for the associated node.  
16

17 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
18 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
19 attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office apparently cites again  
20 to column 5, lines 38-55, and column 6, lines 40-56, reproduced above, in support  
21 of its argument.  
22

23 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
24 anywhere else in Draper, that disclose or even suggest individual nodes having  
25 unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods  
or services*. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database. For at  
least this reason, claim 48 is allowable.

Claims 49-53 depend from claim 48 and are allowable as depending from  
an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
features which, in combination with those recited in claim 48, are neither disclosed

1 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
2 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claims  
3 50-53 over the combination with Papierniak is not seen to add anything of  
4 significance.

#### 6 **Claims 54-56**

7 **Claim 54** recites a method of locating goods or services comprising  
8 [emphasis added]:

- 9
- 10 • defining a hierarchical tree structure comprising multiple nodes that
- 11 each can define a physical or logical entity, said multiple nodes
- 12 comprising parent and children nodes, at least some of the parent
- 13 nodes and their associated children nodes having IDs that are unique
- 14 for the associated node;
- 15 • *associating one or more goods or services* with one or more of the
- 16 nodes; and
- 17 • traversing one or more of the multiple nodes to *discover a good or*
- 18 *service*.

19 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
20 discloses associating one or more goods or services with one or more nodes and  
21 traversing one or more of the multiple nodes to discover a good or service. The  
22 Office cites to figure 2B, figure 5, figure 6B, and column 5, lines 1-12, reproduced  
23 below, in support of its argument.

24 FIG. 5 illustrates the operation flow for mapper 50, in accordance  
25 with one embodiment. In this embodiment, it is assumed that  
structured organization 52 is generated in the normalized approach  
described earlier, referencing FIG. 3, and meta-table 56' of FIG. 4 is  
employed for description 56. As illustrated, at 82, mapper 50  
traverses a logical representation of semi-structured data 54  
assigning identifiers to all entities (and if applicable, their multiple

1 instantiations). At the same, mapper 50 also keeps track of all  
2 entities with multiple instantiations, as well as setting the applicable  
3 flags and recording the applicable annotations. At 84, mapper 50  
4 selects the root node, creates a base table, and assigns a first column  
5 of the base table for the root entity.

6 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in this excerpt, the cited  
7 figures, or anywhere else in Draper that discloses or even suggests *associating one*  
8 *or more goods or services* with one or more nodes and traversing one or more of  
9 the multiple nodes to *discover a good or service*. Draper's disclosure deals with  
10 converting semi-structured data, such as XML encoded data, to structured data  
11 storage, such as an SQL database, and does not disclose or suggest *associating*  
12 *one or more goods or services* with one or more nodes and traversing one or more  
13 of the multiple nodes to *discover a good or service*. For at least this reason, claim  
14 54 is allowable.

15 **Claims 55-56** depend from claim 54 and are allowable as depending from  
16 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
17 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 54, are neither disclosed  
18 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
19 another.

### 20 **Claim 57**

21 **Claim 57** is a computer-readable medium claim and is of comparable scope  
22 to claim 54. Hence, for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claim 54 being  
23 allowable, this claim is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses  
24 the Office's rejection.  
25

1        **Claims 58-60**

2        **Claim 58** recites a method of building context-aware data structures  
3 [emphasis added]:

- 4
- 5        • receiving input from a source that specifies information pertaining to  
6        physical and/or logical entities;
  - 7        • processing the information to define a hierarchical tree structure  
8        having a context, the tree structure comprising multiple nodes each  
9        of which represent a separate physical or logical entity, said multiple  
10       nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at least some of the  
11       parent nodes and their associated children nodes having IDs that are  
12       unique for the associated node;
  - 13       • linking at least one of the multiple nodes to a node of another tree  
14       structure having a context and multiple nodes that represent physical  
15       and/or logical entities, individual nodes having unique IDs that can  
16       serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or*  
17       *services,*
  - 18       • the tree structures being configured for traversal in a manner that  
19       enables context to be derived from one or more of the nodes.

20       In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
21       discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
22       attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office cites to figure 2B,  
23       figure 6B, column 5, lines 1-12, and column 4, lines 10-28 and 42-67, reproduced  
24       below, in support of its argument.

25       Entity A is said to be the parent entity of entities B, E, G and H.  
Entities B, E, G and H are said to be the children entities of entity A.  
Similarly, entity B is said to be the parent entities for entities C and  
D respectively, whereas entities E, G and the two instantiations of  
entity H are the parent entities for the two instantiations of entity F,  
and the two instantiations of entity I respectively. The two  
instantiations of entity F, and the two instantiations of entity I are  
said to be the children entities of E, G and the two instantiations of  
entity H respectively. *Col. 4, lines 10-28.*

1 The approach is said to be a normalized organization of the  
2 relational tables. FIG. 4 illustrates description of correspondence  
3 between the semi-structured data and the generated structured  
4 organization, in accordance with one embodiment. As illustrated,  
5 description 56' is a meta-table having a number of row entries 72,  
6 one for each pair of parent and child nodes. Meta-table 56' includes  
7 seven columns 74a-74g, storing identifiers for the in-context, the  
8 parent node, the child node, the out-context, the storage table, the  
9 parent column and the child column. That is, columns 74a-74d track  
10 the hierarchical information of semi-structured data 54, and columns  
11 74e-74g track the storage location information of the structured  
12 organization 52. Additionally, meta-table 56' includes a number of  
13 miscellaneous columns (not shown) for storing various flags and  
14 annotations. These miscellaneous flags and annotations include e.g.  
15 a flag that distinguishes between an "element" versus an "attribute",  
16 an annotation that denotes whether a child can occur more than once  
17 with respect to a parent, another annotation that denotes whether the  
18 child must occur at all. Each row entry 72 always contains  
19 information in columns 74b-74c and 74e-74g. Row entries 72 for  
20 parent-child pairs involving multiple instantiations also contain  
21 information in the "context" columns 74a and 74d. Where  
22 applicable, row entries 72 also include the aforementioned flags and  
23 annotations. Col. 4, lines 42-67.

14  
15 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
16 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
17 unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods*  
18 *or services*. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
19 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database, and  
20 does not disclose or suggest individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a  
21 *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services*. Accordingly, for  
22 at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

23 **Claims 59-60** depend from claim 58 and are allowable as depending from  
24 an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited  
25 features which, in combination with those recited in claim 58, are neither disclosed

1 nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one  
2 another. In addition, given the allowability of these claims, the rejection of claim  
3 60 over the combination with Simonetti is not seen to add anything of  
4 significance.

5  
6 **Claim 61**

7 **Claim 61** recites a system for determining context comprising [emphasis  
8 added]:

- 9
- 10 • one or more computer-readable media; and
  - 11 • a hierarchical tree structure resident on the media and comprising  
12 multiple nodes each of which represent geographical divisions of the  
13 Earth, individual nodes comprising an entity identification (EID) that  
14 is unique to the node, EIDs serving as a *basis by which attributes  
15 can be assigned to goods or services* associated with an individual  
16 node, said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at  
least some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes  
having EIDs that are unique for the associated node;
  - 17 • wherein at least some of the nodes comprise a node selected from a  
18 group of nodes comprising: political entities, natural entities,  
19 infrastructure entities, and public places.

20 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
21 discloses EIDs serving as a basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or  
22 services associated with an individual node. The Office apparently cites to column  
23 5, lines 38-55, and column 6, lines 40-56, reproduced above, in support of its  
24 argument.

25 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests “individual nodes  
comprising an entity identification (EID) that is unique to the node, EIDs serving  
as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services* associated

1 with an individual node.” Draper’s disclosure deals with converting semi-  
2 structured data, such as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an  
3 SQL database, and does not disclose or suggest EIDs serving as a *basis by which*  
4 *attributes can be assigned to goods or services* associated with an individual  
5 node. Additionally, the secondary reference to Simonetti neither discloses nor  
6 suggests the claimed subject matter. Accordingly, for at least this reason, claim 61  
7 is allowable.

### 8 9 Claim 62

10 **Claim 62** recites a system for determining context comprising [emphasis  
11 added]:

- 12 • one or more computer-readable media;
- 13 • a first hierarchical tree structure having multiple nodes associated  
14 with a first context;
- 15 • at least one second hierarchical tree structure having multiple nodes  
16 associated with a second context; and
- 17 • at least one node from the at least one second hierarchical tree  
18 structure being linked with one node on the first hierarchical tree  
19 structure by a link that is configured to enable a complete context to  
20 be derived from the first and second contexts, individual nodes  
21 having unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can*  
22 *be assigned to goods or services*,
- 23 • said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at least  
24 some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes having  
25 IDs that are unique for the associated node;
- wherein the nodes of the first hierarchical tree structure comprise  
geographical divisions of the Earth;
- wherein the first and the at least one second hierarchical tree  
structures comprise a plurality of attributes, one of which comprising  
information that pertains to the tree with which the node is  
associated.

1 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
2 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
3 attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office again cites to figure 2B,  
4 figure 6B, column 5, lines 1-12, and column 4, lines 10-28 and 42-67, reproduced  
5 above, in support of its argument.

6 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
7 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
8 unique IDs that can serve as a ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods***  
9 ***or services***. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
10 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database, and  
11 does not disclose or suggest individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a  
12 ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services***. Accordingly, for  
13 at least this reason, claim 62 is allowable.

### 14 15 **Claim 63**

16 **Claim 63** recites a computer-implemented method of determining context  
17 comprising [emphasis added]:

- 18
- 19 • accessing first and one or more second hierarchical tree structures  
20 that are resident on one or more computer-readable media, each tree  
21 structure having multiple nodes, the nodes of the first hierarchical  
22 tree structure being associated with a first context, the nodes of the  
23 one or more second hierarchical tree structures being associated with  
24 a second context; and
  - 25 • traversing multiple nodes of at least one of the tree structures to  
derive a context, individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve  
as a ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services***,  
said multiple nodes comprising parent and children nodes, at least  
some of the parent nodes and their associated children nodes having  
IDs that are unique for the associated node;



1 wherein the nodes of the first hierarchical tree comprise  
2 geographical divisions of the Earth; and  
3 wherein the traversing comprises traversing at least one node on  
4 each tree to derive the context.

5 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
6 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a basis by which  
7 attributes can be assigned to goods or services. The Office cites to figure 2B,  
8 figure 6B, column 5, lines 1-12, and column 4, lines 10-28 and 42-67, reproduced  
9 above, in support of its argument.

10 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
11 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
12 unique IDs that can serve as a *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods*  
13 *or services*. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
14 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database, and  
15 does not disclose or suggest individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a  
16 *basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services*. Accordingly, for  
17 at least this reason, claim 63 is allowable.

#### 18 **Claim 64**

19 **Claim 64** recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-  
20 readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a handheld, mobile  
21 computing device, cause the computing device to [emphasis added]:

- 22 • access first and second hierarchical tree structures, each tree  
23 structure having multiple nodes, the nodes of the first hierarchical  
24 tree structure being associated with a first location context, the nodes  
25 of the second hierarchical tree structure being associated with a

1 second location context, at least one node of the second hierarchical  
2 tree structure being linked with a node of the first hierarchical tree  
3 structure; and


- 4 • traverse at least one node of each tree structure to derive a location  
5 context, at least one node in a traversal path that leads to a root node  
6 of the second hierarchical tree structure being linked with a node of  
7 the first hierarchical tree structure, individual nodes having unique  
8 IDs that can serve as a ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to  
9 goods or services***, said multiple nodes comprising parent and  
10 children nodes, at least some of the parent nodes and their associated  
11 children nodes having IDs that are unique for the associated node.  
12

13 In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Draper  
14 discloses individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a ***basis by which  
15 attributes can be assigned to goods or services***. The Office again cites to figure  
16 2B, figure 6B, column 5, lines 1-12, and column 4, lines 10-28 and 42-67,  
17 reproduced above, in support of its argument.  
18

19 Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing in these excerpts, or  
20 anywhere else in Draper, that discloses or even suggests individual nodes having  
21 unique IDs that can serve as a ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods  
22 or services***. Draper's disclosure deals with converting semi-structured data, such  
23 as XML encoded data, to structured data storage, such as an SQL database, and  
24 does not disclose or suggest individual nodes having unique IDs that can serve as a  
25 ***basis by which attributes can be assigned to goods or services***. Accordingly, for  
at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

Respectfully Submitted,

By:   
Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256